

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 T-MOBILE USA, INC.,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 ANITA WALTZ, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.

Case No. C06-0187L

ORDER REQUESTING  
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING

14  
15 This matter comes before the Court on Anita Walts' motion for reconsideration of  
16 the Court's March 2, 2006 Order denying T-Mobile's motion for a temporary restraining  
17 order, scheduling a March 28, 2006 hearing on T-Mobile's motion for a preliminary  
18 injunction, renoting Walts' pending dispositive motions, and permitting T-Mobile to  
19 conduct limited discovery in advance of the preliminary injunction proceedings. (Dkt.  
20 #14, the "Order"). Walts requests that the Court stay discovery and the preliminary  
21 injunction motion pending resolution of her dispositive motions.

22 With her motion for reconsideration, Walts has filed a "stipulation" in which she  
23 and her husband agree that they "will not transfer, sell, or otherwise dispose of any  
24 property or assets derived, directly or indirectly, from any money, property, assets,

25  
26 ORDER REQUESTING  
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING - 1

1 service or things of value allegedly provided by Linco Contractors, Ltd., Ismael Espudo  
2 or any agent of Linco or Espudo . . . ” until the Court rules on the pending dispositive  
3 motions, rules on the motion for a preliminary injunction, or April 15, 2006, “whichever  
4 date is earlier.” (Dkt. #17). The interests of judicial economy and efficiency would be  
5 best served if the Court could rule on Walts’ pending dispositive motions, then, if  
6 necessary, the parties and the Court could brief and rule on the motion for a preliminary  
7 injunction. However, Walts’ agreement not to dispose of the assets extends only until  
8 April 15, 2006, and the Court is not available to reschedule a hearing on the motion for a  
9 preliminary injunction during the first two weeks of April.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, unless Walts  
10 extends the date in the stipulation, the Court will not alter the pending deadlines because  
11 T-Mobile is entitled to expeditious consideration of its motion for a preliminary  
12 injunction.

13 Accordingly, the Court ORDERS the parties to file a stipulation, or if they cannot  
14 agree, supplemental memoranda, addressing the following proposal: Walts’ pending  
15 dispositive motions will remain noted for March 17, 2006; Walts will agree not to dispose  
16 of the assets while the dispositive motions are pending, or in the event the Court denies  
17 those motions, until the Court rules on T-Mobile’s motion for preliminary injunction; the  
18 dates set forth in the Order for responding to T-Mobile’s discovery requests and for filing  
19 memoranda regarding T-Mobile’s motion for preliminary injunction shall be continued  
20 for four weeks from the dates set forth in the Order; the parties will contact the Court to  
21 schedule a new hearing date for the motion for a preliminary injunction in late April or in

---

23 <sup>1</sup> For that reason, the Order stated, “If these deadlines impose an undue burden on  
24 the parties, they may stipulate to reschedule the preliminary injunction hearing for a date  
25 in mid-April or later.” Order at p. 4 n.1.

1 May 2006. The supplemental memoranda must be filed by 12:00 p.m. on March 13,  
2 2006 and shall not exceed 3 pages in length.

3  
4 DATED this 10th day of March, 2006.

5  
6  
7 

8 Robert S. Lasnik  
9 United States District Judge